



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/901,782	07/09/2001	Susan Hardin	0007/01UTL	9388

7590 10/14/2004
Robert W. Strozier
ROBERT W. STROZIER, P.L.L.C.
P.O. Box 429
Bellaire, TX 77402-0429

EXAMINER

SMITH, CAROLYN L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1631

DATE MAILED: 10/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/901,782

Applicant(s)

HARDIN ET AL.

Examiner

Carolyn L Smith

Art Unit

1631

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 18 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☒ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☒ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: 10-17.

Claim(s) objected to: 6,7,43 and 44.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-5,7-9,18-24,35-42,45 and 46.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 25-34.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____

Continuation of 2. NOTE: Adding the phrase "where the tags remain covalently bonded to the polymerizing agent during the sequence of monomer incorporations" to proposed amended claims 1, 7, and 20 raises a new issue which would require further consideration and/or search. The proposed new claim 47 is a presentation of an additional claim without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. In addition, the status identifiers used for the claims include improper claim identifiers. The claim identifiers that can be used are as follows: (original), (currently amended), (canceled), (withdrawn), (previously presented), (new), and (not entered). It is noted that claims 2, 6, 10-17, 21, 24, and 36-46 have improper claim identifiers. In addition, when listing (withdrawn claims), the text of a withdrawn claim must be presented. It is also noted claims 6 and 43 were inadvertently listed as allowable in the final action, mailed 6/8/04, but should have been objected to due to depending from rejected claim 3, directly or indirectly, respectively.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the improper claim identifiers, the raising of new issues, and the presence of an additional claim without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. The proposed amendment is not entered such that all objections and rejections issued in the previous final office action, mailed 6/8/04, are maintained. If the proposed amendment had been entered, then the claim objection; 35 USC 112, 1st rejection; 35 USC 112, 2nd rejections (it is noted that the term "thereof" was not omitted in claim 42); and 35 USC 102 rejections would have been overcome. However, a further search would be required to determine if another 35 USC 102 or 103 rejection would be applicable.

Ardin H. Marschel 10/13/04
ARDIN H. MARSCHEL
PRIMARY EXAMINER